DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 506 FL 014 196

AUTHOR Ben-Barka, Alba C.
TITLE An Attempt toward a TESOL Theory: Some Meta-Research Considerations.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropological Linguistics; Audiolingual Methods; Communicative Competence (Languages); Educational Strategies; *English (Second Language); Ethnography; *Language Research; *Linguistic Theory; Psycholinguistics; Research Methodology; *Second Language Instruction; Socialization; Sociolinguistics; Transformational Generative Grammar

ABSTRACT

A study investigated some theoretical bases of two language-learning approaches, the audiolingual method and transformational grammar. Additionally, the study looked at the concept of language socialization and some anthropological concepts as they pertain to the teaching of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). A brief historical and linguistic overview is presented of recent developments relevant to contemporary American antrhopology; and parallels are drawn between the theories and approaches of linguistics, anthropology, and psychology. Methodological and theoretical considerations about the audiolingual and cognitive approaches to second language instruction are discussed. Key elements of language socialization and their significance to TESOL are outlined, and a practical theory for TESOL is formulated. It is concluded that an integrative approach addressing the psychological and sociolinguistic needs of students through anthropology, will contribute to effective language teaching. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED239506

AN ATTEMPT TOWARD A TESOL THEORY:

SOME META-RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

by
Alba C. Ben-Barka

University of Maryland

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alba C. Ben-Barka

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL014196

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate some theoretical underpinnings of two language approaches--ALM and TG--and, further, to consider the concept of language socialization and some anthropological concepts as they pertain to the field of TESOL, particularly the sociology of language, the ethnography of communication, communicative competence, and the distinction between an emic and an etic approach to language teaching.

Background for the selected approaches was provided through a brief historical linguistic overview of the recent developments relevant to contemporary American anthropology and a comparison of parallels in the theories and approaches of linguistics, anthropology, and psychology. The review of the literature pointed out the lack of an integrated approach and the need for a theory based upon ethnographic work and the notion of language socialization.

Introduction

A cursory glance back through the last few decades of intellectual movements reveals both contrastive ways of thinking within the various disciplines and parallel philosophies and approaches across the disciplines concerned with human behavior. Of these disciplines, linguistics, dealing with a very specialized form of human behavior, particularly abuts upon the concerns of sociology, cultural anthropology, and psychology. Furthermore, these same concerns are germane to the field of TESOL--the teaching of English to speakers of other languages--which, in the past, drew heavily upon adjacent fields. However, rather than adopting any one method or approach, TESOL has predominantly embraced an eclectic approach, all the while looking for unifying principles in order to formulate a practical theory of learning and teaching.

The general scope of this paper is to generate some meta-research considerations pertinent to the field of TESOL. Specifically, the paper will present: (1) a brief historico-linguistic overview of the recent developments relevant to contemporary American anthropology, (2) a comparison of parallels in the theories and approaches of linguistics, anthropology and psychology, (3) methodological and theoretical considerations about the Audio-Lingual and Cognitive Approaches, (4) key elements of the Socialization of Language and their significance to TESOL, and (5) formulation of a practical theory pertinent to the field of TESOL.

AN HISTORICO-LINGUISTIC OVERVIEW

The nature of theoretical orientations and the exigencies of field work carried out in anthropology, have nurtured the interest of many anthropologists in the linguistic behavior of the populations they study.

Hymes (1964) discusses the interest toward language embedded in linguistic anthropology. In a brief historico-linguistic overview, Hymes traces the three recent lines of development relevant to contemporary American anthropology: the English, the French, and the American. The overview of these three lines may be expressed diagrammatically as follows:

Table I

	British	French	American
Major exponents	Tylor Marrett Malinowski J. R. Firth Evans-Pritchard	deSaussure Meillet Durkheim Mauss Levi-Strauss	Boas Kroeber Sapir Lowie Whorf Bloomfield
The definition of language	language is an activity; its engagement in social context is a necessary part of its description	language is a shared, socially inherited system	language is seen as an historical product embodying ways of thought; language is also a patterned behavior or surrogate for non-verbal behavior
The role of language in culture	the relation between language and other aspects of culture is seen as interdependence between different aspects of the same event or social action	the relation between language and other aspects of culture tends to be seen as one of congruence between parallel systems or products of collective psychology	the unity of language and culture is one of cultural product or social heritage rather than one of event or social action
The use of language in communication	tends to be seen primarily in terms of the function of controlling or influencing action	tends to be seen primarily in terms of the cognitive function of distinguishing or expressing meaning	tends to be seen primarily in terms of classification or linguistic categories, not of function.

This overview purported to offer some indication of the close link between linguistic and anthropological preoccupations with language and the place of language in culture. Rather than attempting to exhaust the topic, this writer wishes to present the philosophies of some of the major exponents whose personalities and background may account for their differences of opinion.

British School

For the purpose of this paper, the following three anthropologists were considered representative of the British school of thought: (a) Sir Edward Tylor, (b) Bronislaw Malinowski, and (c) J. R. Firth.

According to Hymes (1964, p.3.), Sir Edward Tylor, the first professional anthropologist, dealt mainly with language in its historical and theoretical aspects in relation to the nature and development of culture. Henson (1971) highlights Tylor's interest in language for its own sake and his particular theoretical concern in finding a rational explanation for the arbitrary relation between word and idea in the origin of language.

Interest in language and the role of language in culture is an interesting theme of contemporary British anthropology. The importance of language in fieldwork is a key concept encountered in the work of Marrett, Malinowski, and Nadel (Hymes, 1964, p.4.). The nature of meaning or the relation between linguistic utterances and the outside word is a recurrent theme of Malinowski's times. Particularly noteworthy is Malinowski's work. In fact, according to Hymes (1964), Malinowski is the founding father of concerns with language in contemporary British anthropology (p.4.).

Robins (1971) summarizes Malinowski's contribution, the context of situation theory, as follows:

1. The old conception of language as the vocal communication of thought was not valid or applicable except as a topic of discussion.
2. Language was a "mode of activity," like other socially co-operative activities, and not a "countersign of thought."
3. Utterances were produced and understood strictly within a shared context of situation, whatever was relevant in the personal, cultural, historical, and physical setting in which the utterances were spoken and heard.
4. The meanings and uses of linguistic forms, words and sentences, were acquired and understood from their occurrences in such contexts. The meaning relation was to be considered as a multi-dimensional and functional set of relations between the word in its sentence and the context of its occurrence.
5. The meanings of words and sentences, therefore, are primarily dependent on and a part of the culture of the speech community. Translation is possible only in the unification of the cultural context.
6. The sentence, not the word, was the primary meaningful unit. Sentences carried the message while word meanings were distillations or abstractions from the meanings, the contextual functions, of sentences.

Contextualization and function of language in different settings are common themes to both Malinowski and Firth. According to Firth (1964), "the central concept of the whole of semantics...is the context of situation" (p.66.). Moreover, language, an integrated part of culture, cannot

be separated from it. "We establish ourselves on speaking terms with our environment, and our words serve our familiarity with it" (p.67.). Also, the multiplicity of social roles played by each person as a member of a race, nation, class, family, school, club, and as a son, brother, lover, father, worker, churchgoer, golfer, newspaper reader and public speaker, involves language mastery and a certain degree of linguistic specialization (p.67.).

French School

In France treatment of anthropology and linguistics can be traced to five scholars, the linguists de Saussure and Meillet, the sociologist Durkheim, and the anthropologists Mauss and Levi-Strauss.

According to Hymes (1964), de Saussure is considered to be the father of European structuralism. The significance of de Saussure's sociolingustic approach lies primarily in his distinction between la langue and la parole: the former pertaining to the society and the collective norm, the latter to the individual person and event (Hymes, 1964). Another significant aspect of de Saussure's approach lies in de Saussure's vision of language as a system of signs, not a simple labelling device. A linguistic sign, for de Saussure, consisted of two components: the "signifier" (ex. tree:/tri/) and the "signified" (i.e., the range of phenomena the word tree signifies) (Ardner, 1971, p.xxxiii).

Meillet, on the other hand, is noted as a great figure of historical and comparative linguistics and for his conception of social stratification as a key to explaining semantic change. Moreover, while Meillet treats linguistics, la langue, as a social fact par excellence, Durkheim views linguistics as an autonomous study with "social facts" as its object, Mauss

collaborated closely with Durkheim and, like him, could be labelled a "social anthropologist" (Hymes, 1964).

A noteworthy anthropologist among those who have continued the French tradition of linguistics as a social science is Claude Levi-Strauss. Like de Saussure, Levi-Strauss felt that anthropology

> aims to be a semiological science...This is yet another reason (in addition to many others) why anthropology should maintain close contact with linguistics, where, with regard to the social fact of speech there is the same concern to avoid separating the objective basis of language (sound) from its signifying functions (meaning).
>
> (Levi-Strauss, 1963a, as cited by Ardner, 1974.)

Levi-Strauss undoubtedly felt the influence of a number of the earlier French sociologists and anthropologists, i.e., Durkheim, Levy-Bruhl and Mauss. Yet, at the same time, Levi-Strauss elaborated the structural issues of social anthropologists into a theory of his own. As observed by Leach, the difference consists in the various meanings attributed to the term "structure." For the social anthropologist, social structure exists at the same level of objectivity as the functional-physiological interdependence of the different organs of the human anatomy. In contrast, Levi-Strauss

> ...is concerned with nothing less than the structure of the human mind, meaning by "structure" not an articulation which can be directly observed, but rather a logical ordering, a set of mathematical equations which can be demonstrated as functionally equivalent (as in a model) to the phenomenon under discussion.
>
> (Leach as quoted by Manners, & Kaplain, 1972.)

The underlying principles of structural linguistics are at the base of Levi-Strauss' theoretical speculations. Language is viewed by structuralists as an arbitrarily constructed symbolic system. The constituent

units of a language--a system of sounds--are its phonemes. The phonemes are meaningless in themselves; they acquire meaning only when they are combined to a structure. The phonological and grammatical rules behind overtly expressed speech patterns are subconscious in nature. The linguist must formulate and make explicit the underlying structural principles which supposedly generate the surface manifestations of linguistic expressions. Structural principles explain the language. Universal structural principles underlie all languages. Moreover, culture to Levi-Strauss is essentially a configuration of symbolic systems. The logical relation of one symbolic element to another is one of Levi-Strauss' major concerns (Manners & Kaplan, p. 171).

In summary, the British and French anthropological traditions both consider language and culture as modes of a single underlying factor: in the British, the unity is that of event while in the French, the unity is that of the mind (Hymes, 1964).

American School

According to Hymes (1964), American anthropological study has shared the predisposition of the French tradition in viewing the unity of language and culture as one of cultural or social heritage rather than as one of event or social action. One of the major concerns in American anthropology has been the interpretation of the origin and social significance of linguistic categories. The scope of the study of language in an anthropological context was directed toward the American Indian throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. Fieldwork was the fundamental source of information or gathering of data.

Fieldwork became an obligatory part of anthropological training under Franz Boas' jurisdiction. Boas, the father of American anthropology,

shaped the field in the first half of the century. The importance of Boas' linguistic investigations was pointed out by one of his students, Kroeber, as follows:

> Boas first clearly realized that it was indispensable for each language to be described in terms of its own configuration, instead of on a preconceived abstract scheme which in practice often came to little more than a modification of Latin grammar. Like Gatschet and Dorsey he also realized the necessity of grammars and lexica being supplemented by solid bodies of texts in the original language.
>
> (Kroeber, 1939b, as cited by Hymes, 1964, p.7.).

After Boas, the main leading figures of linguistic anthropology have been Kroeber, Sapir, and Bloomfield. Like Boas, Kroeber and Sapir shared Boas' focal interest in "language as a historical product embodying ways of thought" (Hymes, 1964, p. 11.). However, Sapir's interest in linguistic function superseded the others. According to Hymes (1964), Sapir ranged much further in the scope of linguistic anthropology by concentrating on the relation of speech to personality, semantic description and functioning, and social variation in speech. In addition, Sapir laid the groundwork for comparative study of Indo-European families (p. 10.).

Together with Sapir, Bloomfield promoted the present standards for field work and description in anthropological linguistics and the effectiveness of the Indo-European comparative method as a foundation of historical work in unwritten languages. Bloomfield, however, rejected "mentalism" altogether, focusing upon the role of language as a surrogate for nonverbal behavior, controlling the action of others (Hymes, 1964, p. 11.).

Summary

A bird's eye view of the three lines of thoughts has been presented. The mini-history was presented in an attempt to point out the close link

between linguistics and anthropology, prevailing definitions of language and of the place of language in culture.

Although a definite statement cannot be made, what appears to be behind recent developments in linguistic anthropology is "a concern for the integration of language in sociocultural context and a focus upon the analysis of function" rather than the concern for the autonomy of language as an object of study and the focus upon description of structure which characterized the first half of the century (Hymes, 1964, p. 11.).

PARALLEL APPROACHES

A glance back through the last decades at prevailing lines of thought in psychology, linguistics and anthropology reveals some interesting parallels among these three disciplines.

In order to present some key concepts without getting into great detail, the following table was devised following Brown's (1980) descriptive model (p. 13.).

Despite the different viewpoints which naturally emerge within each discipline, it is significant to note the similarities across disciplines. Table II summarizes concepts and approaches germane to the fields of psychology, linguistics, and anthropology. The parallels pinpoint certain broad ideas prevailing in the respective times. The origin of these similarities can be easily understood in light of the same interest underlying all three disciplines: human behavior. The respective revolutions in thinking are important for the second language teacher to understand, because an understanding of the varied philosophies can serve as "cognitive pegs on which to hang further information specialized to second language learning and teaching" (Brown, 1980, p.9.).

Table II

Contemporary Lines of Thought in Psychology, Linguistics and Anthropology

Schools of Psychology	Schools of Linguistics	Schools of Anthropology	Characteristics
	Comparative (1850)	Comparative (1850)	Repetition and reinforcement
		Historical (1900)	Learning, conditioning
		Functionalism (1930)	Publicly observable responses
Behaviorism (1940-1960)	Structural (1940)	Structuralism (1940)	Empiricism Scientific method Performance Surface structure
Neo-behaviorism (1950-1960)			Description - "what"
	Descriptive (1950)		So = Su Inductive
			Analysis and insight
			Acquisition, innateness
			States of consciousness
Cognitive (1960-1980)	Generative (1960s)	Cognitive	Rationalism Mentalism, intuition
	Generative Semantics (1960-1970)	Ethnography of communication (1960s)	Use of language in the context of situations
Process	Transformational	Fieldwork	Competence Deep structure
			Explanation - "why"
			So = Su Deductive

In order to understand the field of TESOL, it is essential to understand that the teaching of English as a second language in the United States has been from its inception inextricably intertwined with the field of linguistics. Therefore, it is natural that TESOL has placed great importance on the primacy of language. However, it must be noted that the first linguists were also anthropologists and, by profession, were interested in the culture of any language that they might be studying. Moreover, another

influence that linguistis have had on TESOL is their "scientific attitude," based upon the objective observation of facts rather than the old myths and misconceptions which surrounded language. Teachers of English as a second language have thus learned from linguists and anthropologists that all languages are worthy of study in and of themselves, and that each language is specialized to meet the needs of the culture which employs it as a vehicle of communication.

Among the most important contributions that linguistics has made to the teaching of English as a second language is the concept of contrastive analysis--that is, both a contrastive linguistic analysis and a contrastive cultural analysis of source and target language and cultures (Alatis, 1978, p. 37.).

In brief, according to Alatis (1978), the field and organization of TESOL is founded upon the philosophy of language teaching first enunciated by Charles C. Fries:

> the fundamental purpose...of language teaching is to achieve an understanding, as complete as possible, between people of different linguistic backgrounds... to deal with the culture and life of a people is not just an adjunct...but an essential feature at every stage of language learning.
>
> (Fries as quoted by Atlatis, 1978, p.37.)

Furthermore, Fries' linguistic theory appeared from the first to be directly applicable to language teaching. As Brown (1980) pointed out, Fries' theory was made particularly applicable because of the prevailing psychological theory of the 1940s which claimed that language, like any other aspect of human behavior, was something that could be broken into component parts and practiced repeatedly by the learner through some common drilling techniques like pattern practice (p.234.).

Recent advances in linguistic, and psychological theories have neglected somewhat the notion of patterning in language and the operant conditioning model of psychological theory of the 1940s. Language teaching has been undergoing a new movement based on cognitive code-learning theory. This movement is based upon: (1) the fact that the concept of patterning in language is not adequate to account for many facts about the grammars of natural languages, and (2) the implications that these grammatical facts have for the learning theories of the Skinnerian or behaviorist school (Brown, 1975, p.29.). At this point an overview of the basic principles of both the "audiolingual habit theory" and the cognitive approach can serve as useful background for an understanding of the field of TESOL.

The Audio-Lingual Approach (ALM)

The roots of the audio-lingual method date back to the descriptive linguistics of the twenties. The basic tenets of Bloomfieldian linguists, developed by Bloomfield and applied in the Armed Forces language schools, were adapted to language programs after the war. Given Bloomfield's linguistic background stressing speech as behavior and his acceptance of behavioristic theories of learning, it is easy to trace the relation between the methodological tenets of the audio-lingual approach to the behaviorist model of the Skinnerian school (Chastain, 1971, p.113.).

According to Skinner, language is a mechanical process. In order for language learning to take place, the student must be led through a series of stimulus-response situations in which his active response is followed by immediate reinforcement. Many of the current practices in language teaching such as pattern drills and mimicry-memorization drills rest upon Skinnerian principles. As Chastain (1971) pointed out, these

theoretical considerations have promoted a method in which, in the early stages of the learning process, meaning has been postponed in order to stress development of automatic responses (p.113.).

The following is an outline of the main features of the audio-lingual approach:

1. New material is presented in dialogue form.
2. There is dependence on mimicry, memorization of set phrases, and over-learning (i.e., it is believed that language learning is habit formation.)
3. Structures are sequenced and taught one at a time.
4. Structural patterns are taught using repetitive drills.
5. There is little or no grammatical explanation: grammar is taught by inductive analogy rather than deductive explanation.
6. Skills are sequenced: listen, speak, read, write.
7. Vocabulary is strictly limited and learned in context.
8. Teaching points are determined by contrastive analysis.
9. There is much use of tapes, language labs, and visual aids.
10. There is an extended pre-reading period at the beginning of the course.
11. Great importance is attached to pronunciation, with special attention being paid to intonation.
12. The cultural background of the language is stressed.
13. Some use of the mother tongue by teachers is permitted.
14. Successful responses are immediately reinforced.
15. There is a great effort to prevent student errors.
16. There is a tendency to manipulate language and disregard content.

(Prator & Celce-Murcia, 1979, p.3-5.)

Although some of the linguistic and psychological principles underlying ALM activities have been widely criticized (Chomsky, 1959; Rivers, 1964; Jacobovits, 1970; Jacobovits & Gordon, 1974), many of them are still widely used. Criticism of the principles underlying audio-lingual methodology has come largely from those theorists supportive of cognitivism, another approach employed in second language learning theory.

The Cognitive Approach

The cognitive approach differs from the behaviorist approach in many respects. Supporters of cognitivism emphasize the roles of memory, understanding, and information processing in learning. In the area of language study, the generative-transformational (TG) grammarians are perhaps the best representatives of cognitivism.

According to Harsh (1975), Wardhaugh (1975) and Light (1978), the real contributions made by the transformational-generative approach to language study and teaching are the following: (1) the insights it provides into the linguistic behavior people are engaged in when learning a language, and (2) the explanatory model of the English language system. As Harsh (1975) points out, the transformational-generative approach "...promises to tell us more than we have previously known about how people learn a language and how they use it to produce the infinite variety the language offers to its speakers" (p.7.). In addition, TG grammar can illustrate the passage from one stage in a language to another. And, rather than merely describing a given sentence as structural linguistics does, TG grammar can provide descriptions of a great many of the possible sentences in the language (p.7.).

In order to understand current issues in TESOL, it is essential to have some understanding of the generative-transformational theory (Wardhaugh, 1975). The practical implications of the theory appear to be applicable, to a certain degree, not only to native speakers of a language but also to second language learners. As Wardhaugh (1975) points out, it is possible to illustrate some of the difficulties that arise in teaching English to speakers of other languages by referring to certain specific problems in syntax, phonology, and meaning. The linguistic insights that emerge from the generative-transformational theory can provide some understanding of these difficulties.

Briefly, the TG approach includes the following views:

1. There is emphasis on communication, or communicative competence (i.e., being able to use the language).
2. Language acquisition is seen as a rule (not habit) formation; deductive explanation of grammar is preferred.
3. Pronunciation is de-emphasized, since it is considered futile for most speakers to try to sound like native speakers.
4. Group work and individual instructions are encouraged.
5. There is a renewed interest in vocabulary, especially the expansion of passive vocabulary for reading purposes.
6. The teacher is viewed as a facilitator rather than a figure of absolute authority.
7. The importance of comprehension--especially listening comprehension--is emphasized.
8. Errors are seen as an inevitable by-product of language learning.
9. The written language skills (reading and writing) and the spoken language skills (listening and speaking) are viewed as being of equal importance.
10. Repetition in and of itself is discouraged; silence is recognized as useful and often necessary.

11. There is contextualization of all teaching points through the use of audiovisual aids, stories, or other appropriate means.

12. The use of the mother tongue and translation are permitted.

13. There is an increased interest in the affective domain: the attitude of the teacher and student are seen as important, human sensitivity crucial, and the quality of interaction a significant variable.

14. Bilingual-bicultural proficiency is seen as an ideal goal.

(Prator & Celce-Murcia, 1979, p.3-5.)

In summary, the TG approach places greater emphasis upon deductive explanation of grammar rules and upon immediate use of new language for purposes of real communication. Additionally, with this approach there is a corresponding de-emphasis upon rote memorization and structured drills (Light, 1978). Above all, it's important to remember that the TG approach offers some linguistic insights. It does not offer pedagogical techniques (Wardhaugh, 1975, p.12.). The selection of appropriate techniques for given groups of learners, therefore, rests with the teacher who should be both aware of the two major approaches (ALM and TG) to language teaching and equipped with a knowledge of the teaching techniques supporting each approach. Rather than choosing one approach, it might be best for the teacher to employ an eclectic approach, drawing upon theoretical insights into language learning and communication, and a personal teaching methodology developed through experience and knowledge of given groups of students—that is, knowledge of their needs and interests.

THE SOCIALIZATION OF LANGUAGE

Professionals in the fields of anthropology, sociology and linguistics, have traditionally been concerned with patterned societal

differences. In the last twenty-five years, these professionals have held controversial views about the social patterning of language. In a personal communication with Grimshaw (1967), Hymes suggests that there is a sense in which "the study of language is inseparable from the study of society." Gumperz (1967) rephrases the same concept: "linguistic interaction is social interaction" (as cited by Grimshaw, p.99.). Moreover, as Hymes further suggests, there is "a continuum of possible studies and interests from the less language-involved...from the more correlational to the more embedded" (Grimshaw, 1967, p.99.).

In the past, the aim of theoretical linguistics was the elaboration of context-free linguistic rules accounting for that part of linguistic behavior which is uniform and homogeneous (Giglioli, 1972, p.8.). In the past three decades, however, a growing number of linguists have increasingly become aware of the significance of extra-linguistic elements. In a personal communication to Grimshaw (1971), Labov emphasizes that there are certain aspects of language which are totally independent of any social constraints, aspects in which language variation is governed solely by linguistic rules. However, Labov also added that in the course of evolution

> ...most of these linguistic rules probably underwent some type of variability, and during the course of their variation, they may well have registered social influence, shown stratification, even become markers or stereotypes. But when the change was completed, the area of variability often shifted on to another related section of the rules, and social effects evaporated (Labov as cited by Ardner, 1971, p.96.).

During the course of time, therefore, several alternative theories pertaining to the social role of language have been proposed. Gumperz (1967) devised a dichotomy of the various perspectives. According to

Gumperz, the following two perspectives, summarize the theoretical orientations existing since the 50s: (a) the first sees language variously as an instrument in data collection or as an obstacle; and (b) the second emphasizes language use as data in a correlational examination of relationships between language structures and social structures (Grimshaw, 1971, p.101.).

The range of perspectives can determine the difference of data. The difference in perspectives, however, has not affected the important role of language or speech data in sociolinguistic theory. As Gumperz, Hymes and Labov postulate, collecting representative samples of national speech enables the researcher "to move from gross identification of class correlates to apperception of situation-emotional interrelatedness of increasingly high degrees of predictability (Grimshaw, 1971, p.101.).

Briefly, language or speech data provides useful insights into societal structures. Researchers, for the most part, have made use of linguistic data as an indicator of individual social characteristics or of the characteristics of social structure. Bernstein (1970) identifies the class position of speakers by their use of elaborated or restricted codes. These codes are viewed as the product of two systems of social relationships, which indicate lines of social stratification. Restricted codes are context-dependent and have a reduced potential for change in principles. Elaborated codes, on the other hand, are less tied to social structure and, consequently, contain the potentiality for change. The two codes constrain "the contextual use of language in critical socializing contexts and in this way regulate the orders of relevance and relation which the socialized takes over. Change in habitual speech codes involves

changes in the means by which object and person relationships are realized" (p.165.). Labov identifies both class position and aspiration for mobility through phonological analyses (Grimshaw, 1971). Moreover, both Labov and Bernstein go beyond simple correlational analysis. Bernstein studies problems of learning and of social control; Labov investigates learning and social change. In the work of Bernstein and Labov, language behavior is viewed as reflecting social structure.

To reiterate Bernstein's (1970) words, the study of speech, la parole, entails the study of a particular rule system, "the study of rules, formal and informal, which regulate the options we take up in various contexts in which we find ourselves" (p.161). This system, the linguistic one, is only a part of the whole language network. The other part is made up of a cultural system which governs the various speech codes within the linguistic system. As Bernstein (1970) states, "which speech codes are realized is a function of the culture acting through social relationships in specific contexts. Different speech forms or codes symbolize the form of the social relationship, regulate the nature of the speech encounters, and create for the speakers different orders of relevance and relation" (p.161.).

Goodenough (1981) also explicates the relationship of language to culture and society. Goodenough views language as a composite of standards which can be subdivided into several systems; the phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and symbolic. The last two involve the interaction of language with culture and society. The semantic system deals with "the way in which non-linguistic forms--the entire range of concepts and percepts by which people apprehend their world--are mapped into linguistic forms, the linguistic forms serving as a code for the nonlinguistic forms" (p.10.).

the semantic system, consequently, pertains to the denotative relation of oral aspects of communications (language) to other aspects--i.e., the other conceptual-behavioral domains comprising a culture. The nondenotative relation, moreover, is represented by the symbolic system which comprises the principles governing the expressive and evocative uses of linguistic forms. "Linguistic forms derive much of their shared symbolic value by virtue of social expectations or rules governing appropriate usage" (p.11.). In sum, regardless of grammatical or semantic acceptability, linguistic forms can either be regarded as inappropriate or as appropriate depending on the social context in which they are used (p.10.).

Differences in speech activity and, more importantly, differences in the patternings of speech activity as found among societies or groups within societies are delineated by Hymes (1981). The four important aspects he highlighted are the following:

1. The patterning of utterances in discourse; utterances are sequentially organized into "linguistic routines." Societies and groups differ both in the content of equivalent routines, such as those for greeting, and in the kinds and numbers of their routines.

2. The patterning of expression and interpretation of personality; this process ranges from tempo, and general handling of voice dynamics to choice of expressions and overall style.

3. The patterning of speech situations; societies differ in the settings in which speech is prescribed, or optional. In addition, the following is the set of factors whose interrelations define the patterns of speech; a sender (or source); a receiver (or destination); a message (form or shape); a channel; a code; a topic; a context (setting, situation, scene).

4. The patterning of attitudes and conceptions about speech, cultural attitudes and conceptions regarding speech differ notably from society to society. Differences with regard to the interest in and valuation of speech might have

> correlates in differences with regard to how speech enters into socialization and early education of children (p.2-5.).

According to Pike (1964), every man carries his useful and appropriate cultural norms of reaction of many different types. The appropriateness of the chosen linguistic form or speech code in relation to the culture and society a speaker (or writer) is participating in, is determined by a particular ability. To define, this ability Hymes (1964) coined the term "communicative competence," that is, "a knowledge of the rules for understanding and producing both the referential and the social meaning of language" (Gumperz, 1981).

Elaborating the notion of communication competence, Gumperz (1981) proposes to redefine it as "the knowledge of linguistic and related communicative conventions that speakers must have to initiate and sustain conversational involvement (p.6.). Interestingly, Gumperz's conception of conversational involvement presupposes some sharing of signalling conventions but it does not mean that conversationalists have to speak a single language or dialect. Like Gumperz, Goodenough (1981) also sustains that a person may be competent in more than one set of standards, i.e., in more than one culture. A person's membership in a culture-sharing group is determined by the extent to which he reveals himself as competent in the standards attributed to other members of the group. However, "membership as a matter of cultural competence is different from membership in the social-psychological sense of identifying oneself, or being identified and accepted by others, as a member of a group" (.101.).

Several researchers have addressed themselves to the problem of developing a useable framework for examining communicative competence.

Viewing linguistics as a stimulus to ethnological methodology, Goodenough favors ethnography as a theoretical predictive enterprise to find out "what you have to know in order to operate as a member of the society" (Hymes, 1964, p.13.). Pike's (1964) views on culture, similar to Goodenough's, call for a unified theory or descriptive methodology to account for social units. To serve this purpose Pike coined two terms, "emic" and "etic" (deriving them from "phonemic" and "phonetic") to describe and classify validated native and non-native reactions to specific behaviors. According to Pike, "an emic analysis of the sounds or of the activities of a community" allows predictability of difficulties in acculturation (p.56). Pike's attempt toward a general structural analysis of human behavior grounded in linguistics, therefore,remains within the sociolinguistic domain.

The sociolinguistic domain is the focus of Fishman's (1971) studies. Fishman deals in detail with two approaches to communicative competence: (1) sociolinguistics, and (2) the sociology of language. According to Fishman's distinction, sociolinguistics deals with "ideal," native competence and, broadly speaking, is viewed as a means of widening the contextual horizons of linguistics, from an utterance to sociol-contextual units. Mostly through ethnographic studies, sociolinguistics tries to demonstrate that social units "regulate, predict or generate systematic phonological, syntactic, morphological and semantic patterns where only free variation or weak structure would be evident without their aid" (p.8.).

Conversely, the sociology of language is concerned with language varieties as "targets, as obstacles and as facilitators, and with the users and uses of language varieties as aspects of more encompassing social patterns

or process: (p.9.). According to Fishman, the sociology of language attempts to account for the human capacity to acquire and to use a repertoire of interlocking language varieties. Sharing some basic sociolinguistic concepts yet, holding different views,

> the sociology of language seeks to discover not only the societal rules or norms that explain and constrain language behavior and the behavior toward language in speech to communities but it also seeks to determine the symbolic value of language varieties for their speakers (Fishman, 1971, p.221.).

In short, borne out of the need for an adequate approach to communicative behavior, the sociology of language can be defined as an interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society (Fishman, 1971).

Close to the scope of the sociology of language is the scope ingrained in another approach, the "ethnography of communication." According to Hymes (1964), the ethnography of communication addresses the range of problems addressed by Sapir--that is "the many anthropological, sociological, and psychological problems which invade the field of language" (p.2.). Rather than just correlating separate results from linguistics, psychology, sociology and ethnology, the ethnography of communication "...investigates directly the use of language in contexts of situation so as to discern patterns proper to speech activity, patterns which escape separate studies of grammar, of personality, of religion, of kinship and the like, each abstracting from the patterning of speech activity as such into some other frame of reference) (p.3.). For anthropologists and anthropologically-minded investigators from other disciplines, ethnography of communication seems best to indicate structure and pattern from the standpoint of the communicative economy of the group in whose habits the linguistic code exists (p.3.).

Summary

There is a growing need for an integrated approach to communicative behavior, and to language learning and teaching. While the audio-lingual approach and the transformational-generative approach each provide a useful methodology, the combination of the valid and adequate parts of each approach is "not yet available in one convenient package" (Harsh, 1975, p.9.). Moreover, in view of the considerable evidence that different people learn in different ways, the need for an eclectic approach becomes evident. It is important, therefore, for teachers of English as a second language to go beyond the mere concern for the linguistic code and theories of conditioning--ALM, but to be concerned with the general range of topics directly pertinent to TESOL, that is, the sociological and psychological factors in language learning within an anthropological framework--the TG approach and the socialization of language.

FORMULATION OF A THEORY

Prior to a formulation of a theory which could be of use with ESOL students, the different terms and approaches which have been utilized thus far, especially those of ALM, TG approach, communicative competence and language socialization, and ethnography of communication, merit careful consideration. Wardhaugh (1968, p.81) points out that:

> In each historical period an attempt is made, conscious or otherwise, to unite the prevailing knowledge of language, the prevailing understanding of language learning the the prevailing concept of education goals into a pattern of teaching.

I think that is what is particularly important in the teaching of English as a second language today, and that which explains the interest in the insights which an anthropological approach might offer the TESOL field.

Hymes' (1964) notion of communicative competence, compatible to ethnographic work, implies a model for teaching language based upon communicative conduct and social life rather than just linguistic codes inherent in speech communities. In short, learning and teaching of ESL should include the culturally significant features of the English language, the emic elements, rather than mere etic elements.

The point of an emic or etic account has been a controversial one in anthropology for the last four decades. The controversy can best be understood by tracing it from Pike's (1954) distinction between phonetics and phonemics to the conscious development of the perspective from a linguistic basis beyond linguistics, as inspired by Sapir (Hymes, 1964, p.14.). Following the guidelines of structural linguistics, many teachers favor contrastive analysis. Rather than teaching the total system, however, some teachers fail to teach both what is similar and what is contrasting within the sub-systems of the language. Lack of training and understanding may encourage teachers to concentrate only on the details that contrast. Consequently, structures and sub-systems may be taught "etically" rather than "emically" (Rivers, 1975, p.17.).

Since language is an integral part of culture, full communication is possible only when the speaker understands the reactions he is arousing in his listener and the listener is able to identify the intentions of the speaker. In an etic approach, language teaching is based upon external criteria, not necessarily placed within the internal language system. As Rivers (1975) points out, in an emic approach, "the teaching of cultural understanding is fully integrated with the process of assimilation of the syntactic system and the lexicon" (p.18.). Consequently, instead of concentrating their efforts on the external manifestations of the culture

in an emic approach, the students become aware and comprehend contrasts between systems and sub-systems.

In sum, in formulating a practical theory pertinent to the field of TESOL it is essential to draw upon the principles and theories from other disciplines--that is, linguistics, psychology, sociology, and anthropology. Effective teaching requires an integrative approach which would address the psychological and sociolinguistic needs of the students. An anthropological approach, based upon ethnographic work, may provide a useful framework on which to build a model of language teaching.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Alatis, J.E. The compatibility of TESOL and bilingual education. In the N.Y. State Education Department Publication, Teaching English as a second language: Perspectives and practices. Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, 1978.

Ardner, E. (Ed.). Editorial introduction, Social anthropology and language. London: Tavistock Publications, 1971.

Bernstein, B. (Ed.). Class codes and control. (Vol. 1). Boston: Routledge & Kegan, Ltd., 1971.

Brown, D.H. Principles of language learning and teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Chastain, K. The audio-lingual habit theory versus the cognitive code-learning theory: some theoretical considerations. In R.C. Lugton & C.H. Heinle (Eds.), Toward a cognitive approach to second language acquisition. Philadelphia, Pa.: The Center for Curriculum Development, Inc., 1971.

Chomsky, N. "A review of B.F. Skinner's verbal behavior." Language, XXXV, 1959(1), 26-58.

Firth, J.R. On sociological linguistics. In D. Hymes (Ed.), Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964.

Fishman, J.A. (Ed.). Advances in the sociology of language. (Vol. 1). The Hague, The Netherlands, Mouton & Co., 1971.

Giglioli, P.P. (Ed.) Language and social context. Middlesex, Great Britain: C. Nicholls & Co., Ltd., 1972.

Goodenough, W.H. Culture, language and society. Menlo Park, Calif.: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., 1981.

Grimshaw, A.D. Sociolinguistics. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.) Advances in the sociology of language. (Vol. [illegible] The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1971.

Gumperz, J.J. The speech community. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1968, 381-86.

Gumperz, J.J. The linguistic bases of communicative competence. Georgetown University Round Table. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1981 (in press).

Harsh, W. Three approaches: traditional grammar, descriptive linguistics, generative grammar. In R. Ingrard, The art of TESOL: selected articles from the English teaching forum (1). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1975.

Henson, H. Early British anthropologists and language. In E. Ardner (Ed.), Social anthropology and language. London: Tavistock Publications, 1971.

Hymes, D. The ethnography of communication. American Anthropologist, 1964, 66(2), 1-28.

Hymes, D. Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964.

Jacobovits, L.A. Foreign language learning: A psycholinguistic analysis of the issues. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1970.

Jacobovits, L.A. & Gordon, B. The context of foreign language teaching. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1974.

Light, R. The current scene in second language teaching: A brief background. In N.Y. State Education Department Publication, Teaching English as a second language: Perspectives and practices. Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, 1978.

Manners, R.A. & Kaplan, D. Culture Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Pike, K. Toward a theory of the structure of human behavior. In D. Hymes (Ed.), Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964.

Prator, C.H. & Celce-Murcia, M. An outline of language teaching approaches. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), Teaching English as a second or foreign language. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1979.

Rivers, W.M. The psychologist and the foreign language teacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Rivers, W.M. Contrastive linguistics in textbook and classroom. In R. Ingrard, The art of TESOL: Selected articles from the English teaching forum (1). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1975.

Robins, R.H. A short history of linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.

Wardhaugh, R. Linguistics, psychology, and pedagogy: Trinity or unity. TESOL Quarterly, 1968, (2), 2.

Wardhaugh, R. Some reflections on the state of the art. In R. Ingrard, The art of TESOL: Selected articles from the English teaching forum (1). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1975.